



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,745	03/05/2002	James H. Anderson	56,493 (71699)	8461
21874	7590	01/25/2006	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			SAADAT, CAMERON	
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	
BOSTON, MA 02205			PAPER NUMBER	
			3715	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/091,745	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cameron Saadat	3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 57-66 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-50, and 55-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 51-54 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/2/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

In response to amendment filed 4/19/2005, claims 1-15, 17-50, and newly added claims 51-66 are pending in this application. Claim 16 is cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-26, 28-38, 40-42, 44-45, 47-50, and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Cai et al., hereinafter Cai - Parametrical Modeling Based Multi-Layered Approach for Design and Validation of Catheterization Devices (published June 1998).

Regarding claim 1, Cai discloses a system for designing a medical device for accessing a body cavity or lumen of a patient comprising: providing data relating to a three-dimensional geometric model of the cavity or lumen to a system comprising a knowledge base, wherein the system performs an analysis using the provided data; and obtaining a recommendation from the system based on the analysis, the recommendation relating to the geometry of a device for placement into the cavity or lumen. See p. 32-34.

Regarding claim 29, Cai discloses a system for designing a medical device for accessing a body cavity or lumen of a patient, comprising a plurality of shape knowledge base comprising: a plurality of geometries for at least one segment of a device; and rules for determining correspondence

Art Unit: 3715

between a geometry of at least one segment and at least a portion of a model of the body cavity or lumen See p. 32-34.

Regarding claims 2, 30 and 49, Cai discloses a device shape knowledge base comprising a plurality of geometries for at least one segment of a device and rules for determining correspondence between a geometry of at least one segment and at least a portion of the model of the body cavity or lumen. See p. 33, col. 2.

Regarding claims 3 and 31, Cai discloses a three-dimensional geometric model of the cavity or lumen is obtained from a volume image of the cavity or lumen. See p. 34, Col. 1.

Regarding claims 4, 32 and 50, Cai discloses a volume image obtained from computer tomography scanning device. See id.

Regarding claim 5, Cai discloses a knowledge base comprising data relating to a physical property of the cavity or lumen. The system includes data describing physical shape the patient's vasculature. See p. 33, Col. 2, ¶ 4.

Regarding claims 7 and 33, Cai discloses a recommendation from the knowledge base that is displayed on an interface of a user device connectable to a network. See p. 33, Col. 2, ¶ 2.

Regarding claims 9 and 36 Cai discloses selectable options corresponding to design parameters of the device are transmitted to, and displayed on, the interface of the user device from the knowledge base. See p. 35, Fig. 2.

Regarding claims 10 and 41, Cai discloses selectable options that are selected from the group consisting of: shape, material, flexibility, shape memory, stiffness, softness, pliability, stability, strength, contrast medium flow rate, length, size, and combinations thereof. See P. 32, Col. 2, ¶ 3.

Regarding claims 11 and 34 Cai discloses selectable options that are selected and the system simulates the design of the device based on the one or more selected options or parameters. See p. 33,

Art Unit: 3715

Col. 2.

Regarding claim 12, Cai discloses a device selected from the group consisting of a catheter, a guidewire, a surgical device, a balloon, a balloon-inflating devices, a coils, a stents, stent-grafts, an endoscopes, a laparoscopes, a bronchoscopes, vascular occlusion devices, optical probes, and drug delivery device are equivalents known in the art for the same purpose of performing minimally invasive surgery. See p. 33, Col. 2.

Regarding claim 13, Cai discloses that the design of more than one device is simulated. See p. 33, Col. 2 – p. 34, Col. 1,

Regarding claim 14, Cai discloses that the parameters selected for one of the devices is based on parameters of at least one of the other devices. See p. 33, Col. 2 – p. 34, Col. 1,

Regarding claim 15, Cai discloses a medical device designed to access a lumen which is a blood vessel. See p. 32, Col. 2, ¶ 3.

Regarding claim 40 Cai discloses selectable options corresponding to design parameters of the device that are transmitted to and displayed on a user interface based on data relating to the geometry of the cavity or lumen. See p. 33, Col. 2.

Regarding claims 17 and 37, Cai discloses a device comprising multiple segments and parameters of one or more of the multiple segments are selected independently. See p. 33, Col. 2.

Regarding claim 18 Cai discloses a device selected from the group consisting of a catheter, a guidewire and a surgical device, a balloon, a balloon-inflating devices, a coils, a stents, stent-grafts, an endoscopes, a laparoscopes, a bronchoscopes, vascular occlusion devices, optical probes, and drug delivery device are equivalents known in the art for the same purpose of performing minimally invasive surgery. See p. 33, Col. 2.

Regarding claim 19, Cai discloses at least one segment selected from the group consisting of a tip, a rod element, a hook element and a hub. See p. 33, Col. 1, ¶ 3.

Art Unit: 3715

Regarding claim 20, Cai discloses two segments having varying material properties. See p. 33, Col. 1, ¶ 3.

Regarding claims 22, 42 and 44, Cai discloses performing one or more feature operations to modify the recommended geometry. See p. 33, Col. 2.

Regarding claims 23 and 45, Cai discloses feature operations selected from the group consisting of shape sweeping, extruding, holing, braiding, edge rounding, and hub construction. See p. 33, Col. 1, ¶ 3.

Regarding claims 25, 35 and 47, Cai discloses a knowledge base including clinical information relating to the patient. See p. 34, Col. 1.

Regarding claims 26 and 48, Cai discloses device geometry determined using Finite Element Analysis. See p. 34, Col. 1.

Regarding claim 28, Cai discloses a method wherein the patient has a pathology affecting the structure of the body cavity or lumen. See P. 33, col. 2, last ¶.

Regarding claim 38 Cai discloses, a device materials knowledge base comprising a plurality of data files relating to device materials and rules for determining suitability of a device material for at least one segment of the device. See p. 32, Col. 2.

Regarding claims 55-56, Cai discloses a method further comprising: generating a geometric model of the body cavity or lumen from the provided data; and wherein said obtaining a recommendation from the system further includes obtaining a recommendation of a geometry, topology and physical properties of one or more devices for placement into the cavity or lumen using the generated geometric model. See p. 34, Col. 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3715

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cai in view of James A. Anderson, et al.; Virtual Reality in Interventional Radiology; Min Invas Ther & Allied Technol; 1997; Vol. 6 (hereinafter "Anderson").

The surgical planning system disclosed by Cai does not describe modeling the physical property of elasticity of the cavity or lumen. Anderson discloses an analogous system in which deformations and distentions of blood vessels are modeled. See p. 115. In view of Anderson, it would have been obvious to an artisan to modify the surgical planning system disclosed by disclosed by Cai, to add the feature of modeling the physical property is the elasticity of the cavity or lumen. As suggested by Anderson, the modification would enhance the system by improving its performance in simulating procedures performed within a patient's venous system. See id.

Claims 8, 21, 24 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cai in view of DiGioia, III et al. U.S. 6,205,411 B1; hereinafter DiGioia.

Regarding claims 21, 24, and 43, Cai does not describe determining the best fit between the geometry of the device and the geometry of a path. DiGioia discloses an analogous surgical planning system which determines the best fit between a patient's anatomy and a custom-made tool for insertion into the patient. See col. 2:56-62; 4:66-5:11, 7:64-67. In view of DiGioia, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify the surgical planning system disclosed by Cai, wherein the system assists surgeons in the design and selection of tools relative to a patient's vasculature, to add the feature of determining best fit between the geometry of the device and the geometry of a path. As taught by DiGioia, the modification would enhance the system by allowing the design of tools with the proper size and geometry for a particular patient's anatomy. See id.

Regarding claim 8. Cai discloses all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing the feature of providing a recommendation in the form of a three-dimensional representation of the medical device. However, DiGioia discloses an analogous surgical planning system which See Figs. 5, 7a-e. In view of DiGioia, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify the surgical planning system disclosed by Cai, wherein the system assists surgeons in the design and selection of tools relative to a patient's vasculature, to add the feature of presenting recommended medical devices in three-dimensional form, thereby determining best fit between the geometry of the device and the geometry of a path. As taught by DiGioia, the modification would enhance the system by allowing the design of tools with the proper size and geometry for a particular patient's anatomy. See col. 2:56-62; 4:66-5:11, 7:64-67.

Claims 27 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cai in view of Ulug, U.S. 4,918,620.

Cai does not disclose displaying a rule used for making the recommendation in response to a query. Ulug discloses an expert system that displaying a rule used for making the recommendation in response to a query in order to allow a user to verify the veracity of the rule. See col. 3:3-51. In view of Ulug, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify the surgical planning system disclosed by Cai, wherein the system assists surgeons in the design and selection of tools, to add the feature of displaying a rule used for making the recommendation in response to a query. As taught by Ulug, the modification would enhance the system by allow a user to verify the veracity of a rule. See id.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 57-66 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Art Unit: 3715

Patentability is seen in, although not limited to: independent claim 57, the combination of elements specifically claimed including the feature of providing a diagnostic and pathological information knowledge base, wherein patient data is input into the diagnostic and pathological information knowledge base. The closest prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest this feature in the combination. It is noted by the examiner that the clarity and precision of claim 57 may be improved by inserting the phrase --for the medical device-- in line 16 after "providing an output of the determined one or more appropriate shapes and designs"

Claims 51-54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Patentability is seen in, although not limited to: the combination of elements specifically claimed including the feature of providing a diagnostic and pathological information knowledge base, wherein patient data is input into the diagnostic and pathological information knowledge base. The closest prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest this feature in the combination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 17-50, and 51-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

Art Unit: 3715

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cameron Saadat whose telephone number is (571) 272-4443. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica S. Carter can be reached on (571) 272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cameron Saadat
January 19, 2005




MONICA CARTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER